

**REMARKS**

Claims 7 and 11-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 7, 11 and 13-19 are amended, and claims 1-6 are canceled. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at page 15, lines 23-26, Figure 8, and the original claims. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**I. Rejoinder of Claims**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 11-15 have been rejoined. Applicants also request rejoinder of claims 16, 18 and 19. Where restriction was required between independent or distinct products, or between independent or distinct processes, and all claims directed to an elected invention are allowable, any restriction requirement between the elected invention and any nonelected invention that depends from or otherwise requires all the limitations of an allowable claim should be withdrawn. For example, a requirement for restriction should be withdrawn when a generic claim, linking claim, or subcombination claim is allowable and any previously withdrawn claim depends from or otherwise requires all the limitations thereof. Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable claim will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104.

Applicants maintain that upon the allowance of independent linking claim 7, all claims dependant therefrom must be allowed.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. By this Amendment, without conceding the

propriety of the rejection, claim 13 is amended in light of the Examiner's comments.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**A. Claims 7 and 11-15**

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,938,510 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,954,569 to Hutchison et al. ("Hutchison"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 7 is amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Specifically, independent claim 7 is amended to include "a turret driver for rotating the turret." Therefore, claim 7 recites (in-part): "a turret for holding multiple polishing bodies," "a turret driver for rotating the turret" and "a linking part connecting the rotating controller and the object holder inserted through a cavity of a shaft of the turret." The applied references neither disclose such combination of features nor provide any reason or rationale to provide such features.

Specifically, the applied references fail to teach or suggest a linking mechanism that selects and holds one of the polishing bodies when the turret driver rotates the turret, and a linking part connecting the rotating controller and the object holder inserted through a cavity of a shaft of the turret, such that the polishing bodies and the object held by the object holder all rotate. See specification, page 9, lines 2-14 (reproduced below for convenience) and page 23, lines 7-10.

In the optical disk restoration apparatus according to the second aspect of the present invention, the second polishing body-holding unit holds one of the multiple polishing bodies held by the first polishing body-holding unit (e.g. a coarse polishing body or a buff) for each stage of the optical disk restoration process. Then, the pressing/separating means presses the polishing body held by the second polishing body-holding unit and the object onto each other.

Subsequently, the driver activates the second polishing body-holding unit to rotate the polishing body. Meanwhile, the driver also activates the object holder to rotate the object. It is also possible to make the object passively rotate due to the reaction force resulting from the active rotation of the polishing body. In this process, a rotating controller may be preferably used to regulate the rotation of the object so that a predetermined speed difference or speed ratio appropriate for the polishing process takes place between the object and the polishing body. Rotating both the polishing body and the object causes friction between them and makes the surface of the object polished by the polishing body.

The benefits obtained by such features in the claimed invention are reduced size and weight, and in turn reduced cost, of the disk polishing apparatus, especially when two or more polishing bodies are used since a single motor suffices to rotate all the polishing bodies. In contrast, the mechanism of Takahashi requires a motor for every polishing body since Takahashi discloses "a first sliding elevator member including a geared motor for rotating a scouring member 5A" and "a second sliding elevator member including a geared motor for rotating a scouring member 5B." see Takahashi, col. 4, lines 17-24 and Figure 3. Despite its asserted disclosure Hutchison does not cure the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Takahashi and Hutchison, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 7 or provide any reason or rationale to provide the features of claim 7 and, thus, would not have rendered obvious claim 7.

Claim 7 would not have been rendered obvious by Takahashi and Hutchison. Claims 11-15 variously depend from claim 7 and, thus, also are not rendered obvious by Takahashi and Hutchison. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**B. Claim 17**

The Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi in view of Hutchison as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,520,895 to Senga et al. ("Senga"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 17 depends from claim 7 and, thus, requires all the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, the deficiencies of Takahashi and Hutchison with respect to claim 7 are equally applicable to claim 17. Senga fails to cure the deficiencies of Takahashi and Hutchison with respect to claim 7. Thus, Takahashi, Hutchison and Senga, considered either separately or combined, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 7 and, thus, also would not have rendered obvious claim 17. Accordingly, claim 7 and dependent claim 17 are patentable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Benjamin S. Prebyl  
Registration No. 60,256

JAO:BSP/jth

Date: December 8, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--